

**MINUTES
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**March 10, 2010
reconvened from March 3, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Alternate Joseph Almeida

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elena Maltese; City Council Representative Anthony Coviello; Alternate George Melchior

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Petition of **Strawbery Banke, Inc., The Dunaway Restaurant, owner, and Mombo, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **66 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing fence), and allow new construction to an existing structure (install new fence, add two gates with granite posts, add removable awning over rear patio) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7-1 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March 3, 2010 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the March 10, 2010 meeting.)*

- Ms. Robbi Woodburn of Woodburn and Company and Anna Huusko of Mombo, LLC were present to speak to the application. Ms. Woodburn reminded the Commission that at the last meeting, the issues with the application included the fence design and the canopy. She showed them five sketches of fences that could be seen in the area.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the existing fence would be reused or added to in any way. Ms. Woodburn replied no.
- Chairman Dika asked Ms. Woodburn which of the five fence designs she preferred. Ms. Woodburn replied that all of them were possibilities.
- Ms. Woodburn said that option #1 or option #4 would be their preference. Ms. Kozak stated that she like #4 the best. Vice Chairman Katz said that the fence designs were a vast improvement from what was originally proposed. Ms. Woodburn stated that of the two designs, option #4 was what they preferred.
- Ms. Woodburn said that she had a letter from Strawbery Banke Museum approving of the fence designs.
- Moving onto the canopy frame, Ms. Woodburn suggested a pale gray color that would blend in with the sky.

- Chairman Dika asked if there was any chance the frame could be taken down in the winter. Ms. Woodburn replied no, it would be welded together. Vice Chairman Katz recalled that the Poco Diablo outdoor deck had a winter mode to it. Ms. Kozak commented that she was not worried about it. Chairman Dika said that she really did not want a metal contraption there. Vice Chairman Katz and Mr. Almeida both said that they did not have a problem with it.
- Ms. Woodburn explained that they were proposing a white/ivory awning that would closely match the trim on the existing building. She felt a white awning would have a tendency to drop back. She added that darker colors could be more obtrusive.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that an unidentified architect told him that light colors made bad architecture show up and dark colors made it go away. He said he would like to see a canvas awning with a dark color.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out that for half of the summer; Strawberry Banke has a giant white tent on the grounds. She said that she saw awning as temporary. Mr. Wyckoff disagreed and said he saw it as permanent.
- Ms. Woodburn stated that a dark cranberry was available but the problem with that color was that it would not allow light into it. Lighter colors would allow light to penetrate it. She also told the Commission that the glossy side of the awning would be up but would not be seen.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that this was not temporary. It would not just be set up for a weekend. Chairman Dika asked if canvas would be an option. Ms. Woodburn replied that canvas did not have the life and it would let moisture in.
- Ms. Woodburn wondered what the Poco's awning material was. Mr. Almeida thought it was the sunbrella material.
- Mr. Almeida commented that when the sun hits the awning, the shine will be seen from different angles. He said that he would like to see it a little darker in color. Ms. Woodburn said that the white/ivory color would match the fence. Mr. Almeida thought that the shine would go away over time.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that the awning would be a deal breaker for him. He did not want to see a shiny plastic awning between one historic building and a very award winning historic reproduction on Marcy Street.
- Chairman Dika wished that they could find an alternative to the vinyl awning. Ms. Woodburn commented that the client was eager to get going on this, and would the Commission allow them to move forward with the fences and the framing and then come back to the Commission with samples of the awning.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the Commission in the past has insisted that awnings be made of canvas and have a valance around the perimeter of them. Mr. Almeida concurred with Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika agreed as well. She said she would rather see canvas or sunbrella material.
- Ms. Woodburn said that they would be amendable to using the sunbrella fabric. Chairman Dika pointed out that if the sunbrella fabric was not used, they would have to come back.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that the Commission did not have purview over color when it comes to the canopy.
- At this point, the work session moved into a public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Woodburn stated that the proposed fence would be a solid panel fence with a 1”x 4” picket with a cap on top, the canopy would be made of sunbrella material, and the steel structure would be painted a medium gray color for better blending.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the fence will be a solid panel with a 1”x 4” picket and a cap on top (option #4).
- 2) That the canopy will be made of a matte “sunbrella” material.
- 3) That the aluminum structure will be painted a medium gray color.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Chairman Dika stated the applicant has worked with the Commission and has taken the suggestions to improve their design so that it fit with the historic nature of the area.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote:

- 1) That the fence will be a solid panel with a 1”x 4” picket and a cap on top (option #4).
- 2) That the canopy will be made of a matte “sunbrella” material.
- 3) That the aluminum structure will be painted a medium gray color.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

7. Petition of **152-154 South Street Condominium Association, owner, and Josh R. Gagnon and Nicole S. Bandera, applicants**, for property located at **152-154 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove wooden shakes, replace with asphalt shingles) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 65 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Andy Mourgenos of A & M Roofing was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was seeking permission to remove the shakes from the roof and replace them with thirty year asphalt IKO shingles. There would be a new ice and water shield underlayment and new drip edge. He said any wood structure underneath would be replaced with rough cut lumber.

Chairman Dika stated that it looked like they had already started the job. Mr. Mourgenos explained that they did not know that they needed approval and were stopped by Jason Page, Code Enforcement Officer.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the copper snow guard. Mr. Mourgenos said that they would be retaining that since it was still in good shape.

Vice Chairman Katz asked about the ridge cap. Mr. Mourgenos said that would be removed and replaced since it was rotted.

Chairman Dika asked how old the shake was. Mr. Mourgenos thought maybe 18-20 years old. He commented that the shakes had never been treated and were now curling up.

Mr. Almeida thought the shakes were put on in the early 1980's so they have lasted almost 30 years. He compared that to putting on 30 year asphalt shingles. He wondered if the intent was to do the entire roof. Mr. Mourgenos replied yes. He said that some sections were still in good shape but about 70% of it was pretty worn.

Chairman Dika asked why they were not considering putting shakes back on. Mr. Mourgenos stated that they were pricey and most of the houses on the street have 30 year asphalt shingles.

Mr. Almeida commented that he hated to see another wooden roof go on a building of this quality in the Historic District. Throughout the south end there are a number of examples of shake roofs as well.

Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that the Commission allowed a building in Strawberry Banke to replace shakes with asphalt because of cost. He did not think this was the time to make an example of someone. He felt it was unfortunate but it was one of those eventualities. Chairman Dika mentioned that now there is more focus on sustainability.

Mr. Almeida stated that he felt he needed more information. He said he would like to see the shingle and know more about the copper snow band. He also wanted to know more about the drip edge. Mr. Mourgenos explained that the drip edge would be aluminum and would be brown in color. Mr. Almeida thought it would be a fair compromise to ask for copper drip edges. Mr. Mourgenos said that could be done.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That copper drip edges are used.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that wood shingles were just as temporary as asphalt shingles. In his years of experience, he said he has seen wood shingles last 15 years. Chairman Dika added that they were

much better at the dump than asphalt shingles. He felt this application was appropriate for the building.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (5-0):

- 1) That copper drip edges are used.

8. Petition of **Parade Office, LLC, owner**, for property located at **100 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (add signage, add granite bollards to outside patio area) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Matthew Labonte of Pro Con Inc. was present to speak to the application. He stated that they were seeking approval of signage and granite bollards required by the City’s Liquor Staff to serve as barriers outside of the Conference Center.

Mr. Labonte pointed out the Deer Street elevation which showed a sign in the parapet and a sign on the canopy. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the lighting. Mr. Labonte said that it was a very dim back lighting and was very subtle.

He also showed the signs proposed on Port Walk place. Mr. Labonte also explained that the Liquor Staff has required that a barrier be put into place to delineate the outdoor pre-function space. He said that when a function was taking place, canvas panels would be placed between the granite bollards. There would be chains between the bollards when no functions are happening.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if these would be square granite bollards. Mr. Labonte replied yes and said it would match the granite on the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the canvas between the bollards was the same material for the awnings. Mr. Labonte replied yes.

Mr. Almeida asked if the “Marriott” wording could be raised above the banding. Mr. Labonte said they could move it up to above the horizontal trim band.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Chris Mulligan, representing the Sheraton located at 250 Market Street spoke against the application. He stated that their position was that the inclusion of the proposed parapet sign should be denied. He said that it was a large visually intrusive piece of advertising that was not seen historically along the skyline of Portsmouth. Additionally, he pointed out that when you consider some of the larger buildings that have recently been built, specifically the Sheraton, you

do not see parapet signs like this sitting up high above the skyline. Mr. Mulligan said that their position was that when you consider the neighboring buildings and uses; this particular design element was not compatible with the surrounding properties and detracted from the historic characteristics of the district. For that reason, he asked that that part of the application be denied.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone else wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that assuming that the square footage of the signage was within the Planning Board’s purview, he did not feel it was detrimental to the building.

Mr. Wyckoff added that he would like to amend the motion to include the raising of the word “Marriott” on the Deer Street side.

Mr. Almeida stated that the comments by the representative for the abutter brought up a good point. He said that he was trying to imagine signage of significant height around town and one snapped into his mind and that was the signage on the Sheraton. He pointed out that there was a very high sign on the Sheraton when coming into town. Mr. Wyckoff added that it was a big “S”. Mr. Almeida thought there were other examples around town as well. He felt the proposed signage was appropriate and so he would be supporting the application.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote:

- 1) That the word “Marriott” on the Deer Street elevation is placed above the horizontal band.

9. Petition of **Betty Belcher and Seth Morton Associates, LLC, owners, and Traditional Woodworks, Inc., applicant**, for property located at **207 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add signage and lighting) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Michael Pouliotte, representing Traditional Woodworks, Inc. was present to speak to the application. He passed out additional material to the Commission.

Mr. Pouliotte stated that they have made a change since the original plans were submitted. He explained that they were now only proposing two smaller lights on the top of the sign on the

gable side of the building. He pointed out the specification sheet for the light fixture in the submitted plans. The fixtures each hold a 150 watt bulb for a total of 300 watts.

Mr. Pouliotte said that the second change was to the arm of the lights. They were now proposing a curved arm but would still use the small fixture. He brought a sample of the light for the Commission to review.

Mr. Almeida asked if the sign on the gable end would be painted on the building or would it be a wooden sign. Mr. Pouliotte said it would be an actual wood sign.

Mr. Almeida asked if there would be any exposed electrical conduit and work boxes. Mr. Pouliotte explained to the Commission how the conduit would run. He said there would be a small amount of exposed conduit but it would be painted to match the building. There was considerable discussion concerning this issue.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how the low voltage fixtures would be attached on the front of the building. Mr. Pouliotte explained that they would be attached to the sign. The junctions of the wires would be behind the signs. Mr. Wyckoff commented that it was a clever application. Mr. Almeida added that it was a very appropriate application. He appreciated that the applicant was trying to keep the light level down.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida stated that the signage and lighting were a beautiful addition to the building. He felt the applicant had done a great job of thinking through all of the subtle details.

Chairman Dika commented that it looked like the applicant put a lot of time and thought into it.

Vice Chairman Katz said that when he first looked at the application, he thought there was a lot of signage but then he thought it seemed to harken back to the late 19th century practices when they loaded up the commercial and retail buildings.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

10. Petition of **R and L Enterprises, owner**, for property located at **53 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove portion of fire escape) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct balcony and exterior storage) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (recess existing exit door, add vent duct and other associated renovations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said

property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 51 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry, architect for the project, and Mr. Mike Labrie, co-owner of the property were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that there have been two work sessions and a site walk for this project.

Mr. McHenry explained that they were planning to remove certain elements from the building. They have been working with the Inspection Department to make certain that the elimination of a portion of the exterior fire escape stairs was code compliant. He said that they were proposing to build a new balcony structure and a keg cooler. They would also like to replace certain window openings with door openings and add a gutter and downspouts to the building. Mr. McHenry pointed out that what was new to the Commission since their last meeting was that they would like to replace an entry door on the street level of the Bow Street side of the building.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. McHenry walked the Commission through the submitted plans. He highlighted the door on the Bow Street side of the building where they were proposing to recess it into the building so that the door would not swing out over the sidewalk. He also pointed out the plans for the ceiling of the balcony which would have enclosed down lights.

Mr. McHenry pointed out the location of the hood vent and the new exhaust duct that would go up the building and across the roof. He explained that in order to be code compliant, the exhaust fan has to be 10 feet away from the property line. He pointed out that the exhaust duct was rectangular in shape and would be painted black.

Mr. McHenry gave the Commission a new Page 14 that showed the door unit sizes and more descriptive specifications for the JELD-WEN door systems. He said that the windows would be the Andersen vinyl clad window because that was what was in the rest of the building.

Mr. McHenry explained that they looked into placing the exhaust system inside the building to conceal it but when they pulled away the ceiling area and saw the beam configuration, it was not a viable option.

Mr. Almeida stated that the exhaust system was the most obtrusive item in the application. He felt that the view from the water over the tugboats was second in importance only to probably Market Square. He said that now to bring the duct work up to the roof was extremely bothersome to him. He felt the rest of the application was totally appropriate. Mr. McHenry explained that even if they could go up through the building, there would still be the ten foot distance from the fire wall and would require the duct work going across the roof. Chairman Dika asked if the 10 foot setback from a property line was a new requirement. Mr. Clum said it has been in the codes for years.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that he visited Savannah, Georgia a while ago and said that on River Street, the buildings were very similar to Portsmouth's. He complimented Mr. McHenry on his treatment of the underside of the balcony and stated that in Savannah, they just use sheet metal panels. He added that he did a lot of sightseeing while he was there and did not look up at the roof lines and so he thought maybe people in Portsmouth would not look up as well. Mr. Almeida asked Mr. Wyckoff if he was suggesting that the duct work would not be seen. Mr. Wyckoff responded that it would be seen from the water.

Ms. Kozak asked if there would be downspouts and if so, would it go on all three sides. Mr. McHenry said that the gutter did go on all three sides and connected to a downspout on either side of the property line.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the keg cooler would be white in color. Mr. McHenry replied no, and said that one of the reasons they chose to go with the cementitious planking was so it could be painted.

Mr. Almeida stated that he was not going to support the application. He did not want to set precedence with the duct work. He felt there was a better solution out there. He added that he thought it would be devastating to the Historic District.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he has taken Mr. Almeida's comments to heart. He said he was outraged by the exhaust system on Poco's. He thought that having the mushroom exhaust fan at grade level was far worse. He felt everything else was appropriate.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a 3-2 vote with Chairman Dika, Vice Chairman Katz, and Mr. Wyckoff voting in favor and Ms. Kozak and Mr. Almeida voting in opposition.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Robert R. and Pearl F. Kennedy Irrevocable Trust, Robert R. and Pearl F. Kennedy, trustees, owners, and Stephen Kennedy, applicant**, for property located at **175 Fleet Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March 3, 2010 meeting to the March 10, 2010 meeting.)*

- Mr. Stephen Kennedy and Mrs. Gina Kennedy were present to speak to the application. Mr. Kennedy walked the Commission through the submitted plans. He highlighted that the curved portion of the roof, which he called an "eyebrow" was only there for aesthetic looks. Ms. Kozak pointed out that it was basically trim. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the eyebrow would be duplicated on the north side. Mr. Kennedy replied no
- Mr. Kennedy explained that the windows would be Andersen windows. Mr. Almeida asked if there would be casings around the windows. Ms. Kennedy replied yes.
- Mr. Almeida wondered if they were trying a little too hard to make the addition something that it was not.
- Mr. Kennedy explained that the eyebrow feature was requested by a previous Historic District Commission in 1995. He said it would be fine with him if it was eliminated. Vice Chairman Katz thought that was a good idea. Mr. Wyckoff commented that he thought they should continue the panelized red band around the building. Vice Chairman

Katz added that he thought the new windows should maintain the same proportions as in the original structure.

- Mr. Almeida felt that they should not try to mimic the trolley portion of the building. Vice Chairman Katz wondered if the Commission was intellectualizing it too much. Ms. Kozak cautioned about trying to match every detail of the original structure.
- Mr. Kennedy pointed out the rear elevation where the exhaust fan was located. He thought that was the best location for it.
- Mr. Almeida commented that they would see LVL posts coming up the face of the existing building. Mr. Kennedy explained that they would be trimmed out.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked what the trolley was sitting on. Mr. Kennedy said that it was on jacks and concrete with skirting around it. He also said that floor joists would run underneath the entire length of the expansion. Vice Chairman Katz asked if any weight would be on the original structure. Mr. Kennedy replied no.
- Mr. Almeida said that it would be helpful to show where the LVL will be used.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if the rear elevation would have conventional framing. Mr. Kennedy replied yes.
- Mr. Almeida commented that this was a unique building. He said it was hard to overlay the Commission's typical rules of review because it was so unique. Mr. Kennedy explained that this project came about by the need to bring the building up to code.
- There was discussion as to where the halogen spot lights would be located. Mr. Almeida pointed out that it was a lot of light.
- Mr. Kennedy stated that they would also like to replace the sign. It would be the identical sign, just updated.
- Regarding a public hearing, Mr. Almeida asked that the applicants be clear on paper what it is that they want to do as this would be a difficult application to apply HDC rules.

B. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood Avenue Trust, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new trim work, eave banding, storefront, and fenestration). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey, representative for the property owner, was present to speak to the application. She stated that they would like to take what was an introverted structure currently and make it more extroverted. There was a lot of land around the site and they would like to create some public spaces. Also, there were about 80 parking spaces on the site.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that they would like to expand the size of the windows on the first and second floors, introduce storefronts, awnings, a sign band, improve upon the eave band and possibly add a third floor to the structure.
- Ms. Ramsey said that the general idea for the first floor was something similar to Faneuil Hall in Boston. The second floor could be office or residential space. She said that they were really trying to take advantage of all of the outdoor space.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked the reason for the brackets. Ms. Ramsey pointed out the cantilevered wall beyond the brackets that would give the building a mushroom effect. He commented that he thought the concept was wonderful. He added that this was one of the first buildings to receive review from the Historic District Commission when it was first formed.
- Ms. Kozak felt it was a good direction to move toward. Ms. Ramsey asked what the Commission thought about a possible third floor. The Commission raised no objection to adding a third floor.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out that the Juliet balconies were showing up quite frequently in the Historic District. She said that she liked the way it looked on Ms. Ramsey's rendering

but she thought it was a look they would see in Charleston or Savannah. Mr. Almeida thought they added a lot of energy to the building.

- Ms. Ramsey asked the Commission what they thought of the storefronts along the first floor and the possibility of proposing arched openings. Mr. Wyckoff suggested running with the idea and see what happens.

C. Work Session requested by **Jennifer A. Carsen, owner**, for property located at **121 Northwest Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 16'x20' addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 1 and lies within General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Jennifer Carsen, owner of the property, Mr. Erik Foster, husband of the applicant, Mr. Richard Poutin and Mr. Chris Cadel, builders, were present to speak to the application.
- Mr. Poutin stated that they would like to add a 16' x 20' single story addition to add living space to the residence.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that several Commissioners were absent to give their comments and he wanted the applicant to be aware of that.
- Mr. Poutin explained that he would use clapboard siding which would match the existing house. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he would need to see details of the corner boards. Mr. Almeida suggested noting that the intent was to match existing details.
- Mr. Wyckoff said the Commission would also like to see a window sill under the new construction windows.
- Mr. Almeida expressed concern with the competing roof lines. Considerable discussion ensued on this issue.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he thought the massing was good. Chairman Dika agreed.

D. Work Session requested by **Fifty Five Congress Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Metro PCS Massachusetts, LLC/New England Wireless Solutions, applicant**, for property located at **55 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install six panel antennas behind faux chimneys with associated equipment). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 9 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Brian Grossman, Mr. Bill McQuade, and Ms. Katherine Emmitt were present to speak to the application. Mr. Grossman stated that they were before the Commission recently and were denied a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. He said that a couple of the concerns at the time were the increase in height and the massing. After much discussion with the design team, they have tried to come up with a design that would meet the Commission's approval.
- Mr. Grossman explained that they were now proposing three faux chimneys that would be nine feet in height off of the roof line and about 3'x3' in overall width. Only one would be located on Congress Street and the other two are located to the rear of the building.
- Mr. Almeida asked what type of equipment would be inside the faux chimneys. Mr. Grossman showed him the equipment on the submitted plans. Mr. Almeida wondered that if the equipment was not enclosed, would it be less of an impact. Mr. Grossman said that the enclosures were not required; however, they felt the enclosures would be more satisfactory to the Commission.
- Mr. Wyckoff thought the chimneys might have some use. Ms. Kozak agreed and added that it was a great improvement.

- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the chimneys were set back from the parapet wall. Mr. Grossman said they would be about 5 ½ feet back from the edge of the building.
- Mr. Almeida asked what type of material would be used for the chimneys. Mr. Grossman explained that it would be a fiberglass material that could be molded to show a texture.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked about the cabinet equipment. Mr. Grossman stated that the cabinets would be about 72” high, 30” wide, and 40” deep and would be a gray/beige color.
- Mr. McQuade said they would place screening around the cabinets and it would match the existing screening that was already up there for the AT&T equipment. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the screening would be the same height as the existing screening. Mr. McQuade replied no, it would be eight feet high but it could be dropped down to seven feet to match the existing screening.
- Mr. Almeida commented that the enclosure made it look ten times as large. Mr. Wyckoff agreed. Vice Chairman Katz wondered if it could be seen from the ground. It was determined that it could be seen from some views. Mr. McQuade thought it should be screened for the tenants of the building who utilize the roof top deck.

E. Work Session requested by **111 Market Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Ryan D. Abood, applicant**, for property located at **111 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add roof dormers and roof deck additions). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 39 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Ryan Abood, property owner, Mr. Brandon Holben and Mr. Steve McHenry, both of McHenry Architecture, and Ms. Carrie Barron were present to speak to the application.
- Mr. Holben explained that on the Market Street elevation they would like to remove the existing roofing system for a dormer, replace existing windows, and modify the masonry wall for a proposed window addition.
- Mr. Almeida asked why they did not want to take the dormer higher. He pointed out that the building next door had a similar dormer. Mr. Holben said that they wanted to keep the same window heights and the sills to maintain consistency.
- Mr. Holben also said that they were proposing to add a third window on the Market Street elevation. Mr. Almeida commented that the addition of the third window was a dramatic change. He felt they could go higher with the dormer but adding the third window disrupted the rhythm of the building. Mr. Abood explained that only one of the windows was functional as the other window was in an existing fire escape.
- Mr. Holben pointed out the variety of fenestration on the Ceres Street elevation. He said that page 6 of the Ceres Street elevation showed a new roof, a new walkout and new guardrails.
- Ms. Kozak stated that increasing the size of the windows was more troublesome to her than adding a third window. She pointed out that all of the windows up and down the building were the same size. Chairman Dika agreed. Mr. Abood stated that much of the building was not code compliant. Ms. Kozak replied that 80% of the structures in the Historic District are non-compliant.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked what the Commission thought if the three windows were the same size. Mr. Wyckoff said he would have less trouble with it but the whole vernacular of the building is smaller windows. Mr. Almeida pointed out that there was a very strong repetitive line on the Market Street elevation.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked the same question of Mr. Almeida and Ms. Kozak. Mr. Almeida replied no and Ms. Kozak said she would like to see the windows stay the way they were.
- There was discussion about code compliance pertaining to the windows.
- Mr. Abood asked the Commission about adding a third window to all of the floors of the building. Mr. Almeida stated he was having second thoughts about altering the front of

the building at all. Ms. Kozak added that the building was set up with such a rigid rhythm.

- Mr. Abood commented that federal row starts at the intersection of Bow and Market Streets and runs all the way down to the antique store. This was the most rigid part of it. But if you go one building over, it was completely different. Mr. Almeida said that Mr. Abood just made the case that this was the last remaining truly correct authentic piece.
- Mr. Almeida stated that another work session would be helpful. Mr. Holben asked about a site walk. Mr. Almeida commented that he thought the Commission walked this stretch quite frequently.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that it looked like maintaining the continuity of the roof line and maintaining the window sizes were important to the Commission.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that several other Commissioners will be at the next meeting and will give their comments.
- Ms. Kozak stated that she did not mind the balconies on the Ceres Street side.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:35 p.m., it was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on May 5, 2010.